

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Richard E. Lane, Sr.,

Case No.: 2:21-cv-01305-JAD-EJY

Plaintiff

v.

Order Dismissing Action

Clark County Detention Center,

Defendant

Plaintiff Richard E. Lane, Sr. brings this civil-rights case under § 1983 claiming that he is wrongfully incarcerated.¹ On September 3, 2021, I ordered Lane to file a first-amended complaint by September 24, 2021.² I expressly warned him that his failure to timely comply with the order would result in the dismissal of this case.³ The deadline has passed, and Lane has not filed a first-amended complaint.

District courts have the inherent power to control their dockets and “[i]n the exercise of that power, they may impose sanctions including, where appropriate . . . dismissal” of a case.⁴ A court may dismiss an action with prejudice based on a party’s failure to prosecute an action, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with local rules.⁵ In determining whether to

¹ ECF No. 6 (complaint).

² ECF No. 5 (order).

³ *Id.*

⁴ *Thompson v. Hous. Auth. of City of Los Angeles*, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986).

⁵ See *Ghazali v. Moran*, 46 F.3d 52, 53–54 (9th Cir. 1995) (dismissal for noncompliance with local rule); *Ferdik v. Bonzelet*, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260–61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with an order requiring amendment of complaint); *Carey v. King*, 856 F.2d 1439, 1440–

1 dismiss an action for lack of prosecution, failure to obey a court order, or failure to comply with
 2 local rules, the court must consider several factors: (1) the public's interest in expeditious
 3 resolution of litigation; (2) the court's need to manage its docket; (3) the risk of prejudice to the
 4 defendants; (4) the public policy favoring disposition of cases on their merits; and (5) the
 5 availability of less drastic alternatives.⁶

6 I find that the first two factors—the public's interest in expeditiously resolving the
 7 litigation and the court's interest in managing the docket—weigh in favor of dismissing this case.
 8 The risk-of-prejudice factor also weighs in favor of dismissal because a presumption of injury
 9 arises from the occurrence of unreasonable delay in filing a pleading ordered by the court or
 10 prosecuting an action.⁷ The fourth factor is greatly outweighed by the factors in favor of
 11 dismissal, and a court's warning to a party that his failure to obey the court's order will result in
 12 dismissal satisfies the consideration-of-alternatives requirement.⁸ Lane was warned that his case
 13 would be dismissed with prejudice if he failed to file a first-amended complaint by September
 14 24, 2021.⁹ So, Lane had adequate warning that his failure to file a first-amended complaint by
 15 the deadline would result in this case's dismissal.

16
 17
 18 41 (9th Cir. 1988) (dismissal for failure to comply with local rule requiring pro se plaintiffs to
 19 keep court apprised of address); *Malone v. U.S. Postal Service*, 833 F.2d 128, 130 (9th Cir.
 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with court order); *Henderson v. Duncan*, 779 F.2d 1421,
 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for lack of prosecution and failure to comply with local rules).

20 ⁶ *Thompson*, 782 F.2d at 831; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1423–24; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 130;
 21 *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1260–61; *Ghazali*, 46 F.3d at 53.


22 ⁷ See *Anderson v. Air West*, 542 F.2d 522, 524 (9th Cir. 1976).

23 ⁸ *Ferdik*, 963 F.2d at 1262; *Malone*, 833 F.2d at 132–33; *Henderson*, 779 F.2d at 1424.

⁹ ECF No. 5 (order).

1 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that **this action is DISMISSED** with prejudice
2 based on Lane's failure to file a first-amended complaint in compliance with this court's
3 September 24, 2021, order and for failure to state a claim. The Clerk of Court is directed to
4 ENTER JUDGMENT accordingly and CLOSE THIS CASE.

5 Dated: October 12, 2021

6 
7 _____
8 U.S. District Judge Jennifer A. Dorsey
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23